

Constructive Thinking in Generalized Anxiety Disorder: A Conceptual Framework Integrating Cognitive Experiential Self-Theory With Third-Wave Cognitive Behavioural Therapies

Priyanka Dang^{1*}, Dr. Sandhya Gupta²

¹PhD Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Banasthali Vidyapith, Banasthali, Rajasthan, India

²Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum Studies and Development, National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi, Delhi, India

*Corresponding Author: Priyanka Dang, Email Id: priyanka.dang@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) is a prevalent and debilitating mental health condition characterized by persistent, excessive worry about a wide range of life domains. While conventional cognitive-behavioural approaches have primarily targeted the rational, deliberate aspects of cognition, growing evidence suggests that the automatic, experiential processing system plays a critical role in the development and maintenance of GAD. This conceptual review paper examines GAD through the lens of Cognitive Experiential Self-Theory (CEST), a dual-process information processing framework developed by Seymour Epstein. The paper synthesizes literature on how maladaptive experiential processing, as operationalized through the construct of constructive thinking and its six dimensions (emotional coping, behavioural coping, categorical thinking, personal superstitious thinking, naïve optimism, and esoteric thinking), manifests in individuals with GAD. Furthermore, this review maps the therapeutic mechanisms of five prominent third-wave cognitive behavioural therapies (Acceptance and Commitment Therapy, Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy, Dialectical Behaviour Therapy, Metacognitive Therapy, and Compassion-Focused Therapy) onto each dimension of constructive thinking, thereby proposing an integrative conceptual framework. Clinical implications for assessment and targeted intervention are discussed. This framework offers clinicians a theoretically grounded rationale for selecting and tailoring evidence-based interventions to the specific experiential processing deficits observed in GAD patients.

Keywords: Generalized Anxiety Disorder; Cognitive Experiential Self-Theory; constructive thinking; third-wave CBT; experiential processing; dual-process theory.

INTRODUCTION

Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) is a chronic mental health condition that affects approximately 3–5% of the global population, imposing substantial burdens on individual functioning, healthcare systems, and economic productivity (Wittchen, 2002; Revicki et al., 2012). GAD is distinguished from other anxiety disorders by its hallmark symptom of persistent and excessive worry that spans multiple life domains, including health, finances, relationships, and occupational performance. This pervasive worry is accompanied by somatic symptoms such as muscle tension, sleep disturbance, irritability, and difficulty concentrating, collectively impairing quality of life and psychosocial functioning.

Traditional cognitive models of GAD, most notably those advanced by Borkovec, Alcaine, and Behar (2004), have emphasized the role of worry as a predominantly verbal-linguistic cognitive activity that functions to suppress emotional processing of threatening stimuli. While these models have generated substantial empirical support, they have been critiqued for their focus on conscious, rational cognitive processes at the expense of automatic, pre-conscious information processing systems. A growing body of research suggests that individuals with GAD demonstrate characteristic patterns of information processing that operate largely outside conscious awareness, including attentional biases toward threat-relevant stimuli, impaired disengagement from threatening information, and interpretive biases that favor threatening interpretations of ambiguous stimuli (Bar-Haim et al., 2007; Hirsch & Mathews, 2012).

Of particular theoretical significance is the manner in which individuals with GAD process information through automatic cognitive systems that are aligned with their worldview and self-perceptions. These individuals tend to perceive themselves and the world as fundamentally threatening or dangerous, coupled with a matched perception that they lack adequate personal resources to cope with anticipated threats. This dual perception prompts maladaptive responses, including impaired disengagement from threat cues and various forms of cognitive and behavioural avoidance (Dugas et al., 2004; Behar et al., 2009).

Cognitive Experiential Self-Theory (CEST), a dual-process information processing framework originally developed by Seymour Epstein (1994, 2003), offers a compelling theoretical lens through which to examine these automatic cognitive processes in GAD. CEST posits that human information processing operates through two parallel and interactive systems: a conscious, analytical rational system and a preconscious, holistic experiential system. The efficiency with which the

experiential system operates in everyday problem-solving is captured by the construct of constructive thinking, which Epstein defined as the degree to which automatic cognition facilitates the resolution of everyday problems with minimal accompanying stress (Epstein & Meier, 1989; Katz & Epstein, 1991).

Despite the theoretical richness of CEST and its relevance to anxiety disorders, the systematic application of this framework to GAD remains underexplored. The present paper aims to address this gap by pursuing three primary objectives: (a) to provide a comprehensive overview of CEST and the construct of constructive thinking; (b) to examine how deficits in constructive thinking across its six constituent dimensions manifest in GAD; and (c) to map the therapeutic mechanisms of five major third-wave cognitive behavioural therapies onto these dimensions, thereby proposing an integrative framework that may guide both clinical assessment and treatment planning.

Theoretical Framework of Cognitive Experiential Self-Theory

Cognitive Experiential Self-Theory is an integrative theory of personality and information processing that was first systematically articulated by Epstein (1994, 2003). The theory proposes that humans navigate their environments through two fundamentally different yet interacting cognitive systems, each possessing its own form of intelligence, learning principles, and adaptive functions. CEST has been categorized as both a theory of personality and a theory of decision-making, and it has been applied extensively to explain individual differences in emotional adjustment, coping, performance, and psychopathology.

The rational system is a conscious, deliberative, and analytical mode of processing that operates according to culturally transmitted rules of logic and evidence. It is assessed through standardized tests of cognitive intelligence, such as the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-IV), and it processes information in a primarily verbal-linguistic manner. This system is effortful, relatively slow, and capacity-limited, but it affords the advantages of logical rigor and the ability to engage in abstract, hypothetical reasoning.

The experiential system, by contrast, is a preconscious, automatic, and holistic mode of processing that operates on the basis of learned associations, emotional experiences, and heuristic principles. It is rapid, effortless, and intimately connected to affect. The experiential system encodes information in the form of emotionally laden schemas, or what Epstein terms “schematic representations,” which are shaped cumulatively through an individual’s learning history. This system is assessed not through conventional intelligence tests but through instruments such as the Constructive Thinking Inventory (CTI; Epstein, 2001) and the Rational-Experiential Inventory (REI; Pacini & Epstein, 1999). There are two fundamental components of the experiential system: content and process. The content of the experiential system consists of implicit beliefs that were automatically acquired by associative learning. Regardless of how we learn, if we feel good or bad, it reinforces an implicit need and/or belief.

A critical tenet of CEST is that the rational and experiential systems are not independent but rather operate in a continuous, dynamic interplay. In most everyday situations, behaviour is guided primarily by the experiential system, with the rational system exerting a corrective or modulatory influence. However, when the experiential system produces strongly affect-laden responses, it can override rational processing, leading to behaviour that is inconsistent with the individual’s reflective judgments. This dynamic is of particular relevance to anxiety disorders, where affectively charged experiential processing may dominate cognitive functioning despite intact rational capacities.

Research utilizing the REI has demonstrated that the degree to which individuals engage in rational versus experiential processing has significant implications for psychological adjustment. Findings indicate that insufficient engagement in rational processing is associated with symptoms of depression, anxiety, elevated stress levels, and neuroticism, whereas balanced engagement in both systems is associated with optimal psychological functioning (Pacini & Epstein, 1999; Epstein, 2003).

Constructive Thinking: Definition, Assessment, and Dimensions

Constructive thinking refers to the degree to which an individual’s automatic cognitive processing, the thinking that occurs without deliberate intention or conscious effort, effectively facilitates the resolution of everyday problems at a minimum cost in stress (Epstein & Meier, 1989). Unlike rational intelligence, which pertains to the capacity for deliberate analytical reasoning, constructive thinking reflects the intelligence or efficacy of the experiential system. It constitutes an adaptive propensity that has been found to be positively associated with adaptation across multiple life domains, including emotional adjustment, physical well-being, occupational performance, academic achievement, social competence, and leadership ability (Epstein & Meier, 1989; Katz & Epstein, 1991; Epstein, 2001).

The primary instrument for assessing constructive thinking is the Constructive Thinking Inventory (CTI; Epstein, 2001), a self-report measure that evaluates the habitual functioning of the experiential system across multiple dimensions. Performance on the CTI has been demonstrated to predict a wide range of outcomes, including emotional adjustment, stress coping capacity, physical well-being, occupational and academic performance, social facility, leadership ability, and the absence of substance abuse (Epstein, 2001). The CTI is complemented by the Rational-Experiential Inventory (REI;

Pacini & Epstein, 1999), which measures the extent to which individuals engage in experiential versus rational processing modes.

The CTI operationalizes constructive thinking through six primary dimensions, each capturing a distinct aspect of experiential processing. Table 1 presents these dimensions with their descriptions and associated psychological impacts when constructive thinking is deficient.

Table 1. Dimensions of Constructive Thinking and Associated Psychological Impact of Deficiency.

Dimension	Description	Psychological Impact of Deficiency
Emotional Coping	Capacity to manage stress and regulate emotions in daily life without becoming overwhelmed.	Low self-acceptance, overgeneralization following unfavorable outcomes, excessive sensitivity to criticism, and ruminative dwelling on negative events.
Behavioral Coping	Capacity to act effectively in solving everyday problems and adapting behavior flexibly.	Obsessive problem rumination or procrastination, reduced effort and premature disengagement; significantly associated with alcohol and substance use problems.
Categorical Thinking	Tendency to think in rigid, dichotomous categories versus flexible, nuanced appraisals.	Impulsive anger, suppressed anger, favorable views of aggression, low agreeableness, poor interpersonal relationships, high anxiety, and elevated physiological arousal.
Personal Superstitious Thinking	Propensity for magical thinking, belief in fate, and illogical causal attributions.	Pessimism, learned helplessness, proneness to depression, psychosomatic symptoms, and impaired self-regulation.
Naïve Optimism	Unrealistically positive appraisals or denial of problems.	Tendency to ignore unpleasant realities and corresponding failure to initiate protective action in potentially threatening situations.
Esoteric Thinking	Belief in scientifically unsubstantiated phenomena (e.g., ghosts, astrology, omens).	Deficient disciplined thinking and excessive reliance on intuitive and associative impressions.

Maladaptive Experiential Processing in GAD

Individuals with GAD frequently demonstrate intact rational processing capacities when explicitly prompted to engage in deliberative reasoning. However, their automatic experiential processing is characteristically maladaptive, driven by several interconnected mechanisms: heightened threat sensitivity, a negative learning history that has shaped threat-oriented experiential schemas, poor emotional regulation at the automatic level, and cognitive biases that continuously feed maladaptive experiential responses (Bar-Haim et al., 2007; Hirsch & Mathews, 2012).

This pattern is consistent with CEST's prediction that the experiential system, being more closely tied to affective processing, will dominate cognitive functioning in emotionally charged situations. For individuals with GAD, the chronic nature of their anxiety means that the experiential system is persistently activated in a threat-oriented mode, undermining the corrective influence of the rational system and perpetuating a cycle of maladaptive automatic cognition. The deficits in constructive thinking observed in GAD can be systematically mapped onto each of the six CTI dimensions. Table 2 presents these manifestations with illustrative clinical examples.

Table 2. Manifestations of Reduced Constructive Thinking in GAD Across CTI Dimensions.

CTI Dimension	Manifestation in GAD	Clinical Example
Emotional Coping	Difficulty calming down, managing uncertainty, or controlling physiological arousal.	A student with GAD experiences intense anticipatory worry before examinations, suffers from insomnia, and engages in repetitive catastrophic self-questioning.
Behavioral Coping	Avoidance or excessive preparation instead of flexible problem-solving.	A professional with GAD avoids initiating projects due to fear of error or invests

		disproportionate time in checking minor details.
Categorical Thinking	Rigid, dichotomous appraisals; situations perceived as complete disasters or complete successes.	Belief that any imperfection in a presentation will lead to the perception of total incompetence and subsequent job loss.
Personal Superstitious Thinking	Magical thinking or ritualistic behaviors to prevent feared outcomes.	Compulsive checking behaviors (e.g., verifying appliance settings repeatedly) driven by the belief that failure to do so will cause harm.
Naïve Optimism	Oscillation between unrealistic reassurance-seeking and deep worry rather than stable optimism.	Repeatedly seeking confirmation from others that outcomes will be favourable but being unable to sustain reassurance.
Esoteric Thinking	Attribution of significance to coincidences, days, or patterns.	Belief that negative events are more likely on certain days, leading to avoidance of activities on those days.

Pathways to Improving Constructive Thinking in GAD

Epstein (2003) proposed several principles for improving the functioning of the experiential system that have direct relevance to therapeutic interventions for GAD. These principles include cultivating an attitude of acceptance toward one's emotional experiences; developing understanding of one's chain of automatic reactions; becoming aware of one's habitual construals and interpretive patterns; monitoring secondary mental and behavioural responses that follow initial appraisals; and identifying personal sensitivities and compulsive behavioural patterns. These principles share notable conceptual overlap with the therapeutic mechanisms of several third-wave cognitive behavioural therapies, a convergence that is explored in detail in the following section.

Mapping Third-Wave Cognitive Behavioural Therapies onto Dimensions of Constructive Thinking

Third-wave cognitive behavioural therapies (CBTs) represent an evolution in the cognitive-behavioural tradition that places greater emphasis on processes such as acceptance, mindfulness, defusion, metacognition, and compassion, rather than direct cognitive restructuring. These include Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT; Hayes, Strosahl, & Wilson, 2012), Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT; Segal, Williams, & Teasdale, 2013), Dialectical Behaviour Therapy (DBT; Linehan, 2015), Metacognitive Therapy (MCT; Wells, 2009), and Compassion-Focused Therapy (CFT; Gilbert, 2010). Each of these approaches, while distinct in its theoretical emphasis and therapeutic techniques, targets processes that can be mapped onto one or more dimensions of constructive thinking. Table 3 presents a systematic mapping of the five third-wave CBT approaches onto Epstein's six dimensions of constructive thinking, specifying the primary therapeutic mechanism by which each approach targets each dimension.

Table 3. Mapping of Third-Wave CBT Therapeutic Mechanisms onto Dimensions of Constructive Thinking.

Dimension	ACT	MBCT	DBT (adapted)	MCT	CFT
Emotional Coping	Acceptance of anxiety; defusion from anxious thoughts	Mindfulness meditation; decentering from worry	Emotion regulation skills; opposite action	Detached mindfulness to observe worry without engagement	Soothing rhythm breathing; compassionate imagery
Behavioural Coping	Committed action guided by personal values	Grounding in present experience to reduce avoidance	Distress tolerance skills (e.g., STOP skill, self-soothing)	Worry postponement; attention training technique	Compassionate self-support to encourage behavioural activation
Categorical Thinking	Cognitive defusion enabling flexible perspective-taking	Non-judgmental awareness fostering fluid appraisal	Dialectical stance promoting both/and thinking	Attention Training Technique to shift focus flexibly	Reframing harsh judgments through compassionate reasoning

Personal Superstitious Thinking	Acceptance undermines control-based beliefs about worry	Mindfulness disrupts beliefs that worry prevents danger	Mindful awareness of emotions without attaching false meaning	Challenging positive and negative meta-beliefs about worry	Self-compassion replaces shame-based irrational beliefs
Naïve Optimism	Values-based action maintains realistic optimism	Mindful reflection balances optimism with present-moment awareness	Emotion regulation promotes balanced appraisals	Re-evaluation of worry beliefs prevents exaggeration and denial	Compassionate self-talk balances hope with realistic risk awareness
Constructive Thinking (global)	Living by values despite the presence of anxiety	Improved attentional control and clarity of thought	Practical coping via integration of mindfulness and regulation skills	Metacognitive awareness enables self-directed thinking	Self-compassion fosters a supportive internal dialogue

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT)

ACT targets the experiential system primarily through the processes of acceptance and cognitive defusion. By fostering willingness to experience uncomfortable internal states (including anxiety and worry) without attempting to control or eliminate them, ACT directly addresses the emotional coping dimension of constructive thinking. The defusion techniques employed in ACT, which involve creating psychological distance from the literal content of thoughts, promote cognitive flexibility, thereby targeting categorical thinking. Furthermore, ACT's emphasis on committed action guided by personal values serves to enhance behavioural coping by redirecting behaviour from avoidance-driven patterns toward values-consistent engagement with life. Notably, ACT's acceptance stance also undermines the control-based beliefs that characterize personal superstitious thinking, while its values orientation ensures that optimism remains grounded in realistic, purposeful action rather than naïve denial (Hayes et al., 2012).

Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT)

MBCT enhances constructive thinking primarily through the cultivation of mindful awareness and the process of decentering. Mindfulness meditation practices strengthen emotional coping by enabling individuals to observe emotional states with equanimity rather than reactivity. The decentering process, the ability to observe thoughts as transient mental events rather than accurate reflections of reality, addresses categorical thinking by promoting more fluid and nuanced appraisal processes. MBCT's emphasis on present-moment grounding directly counters the avoidance patterns that reflect deficient behavioural coping, while its non-judgmental attentional stance disrupts the associative links between worry and perceived danger that characterize personal superstitious thinking (Segal et al., 2013).

Dialectical Behaviour Therapy (DBT)

DBT, originally developed for borderline personality disorder but increasingly adapted for anxiety disorders, contributes to constructive thinking through its emphasis on dialectical thinking, emotion regulation, and distress tolerance. The dialectical stance, holding apparently contradictory positions simultaneously (both/and rather than either/or), directly targets categorical thinking by promoting cognitive flexibility. The emotion regulation module enhances emotional coping through skills such as opposite action, while the distress tolerance module strengthens behavioural coping by providing concrete strategies for managing acute distress without resorting to avoidance. DBT's mindfulness component further supports the identification and modification of superstitious and magical thinking patterns (Linehan, 2015).

Metacognitive Therapy (MCT)

MCT addresses constructive thinking deficits through its focus on metacognitive beliefs and attentional processes. The practice of detached mindfulness, observing worry without engaging with it or attempting to control it, directly enhances emotional coping by modifying the individual's relationship with worry. The Attention Training Technique (ATT) promotes cognitive flexibility, thereby targeting categorical thinking, while worry postponement serves as a behavioural coping strategy by introducing deliberate control over the timing and duration of worry. Critically, MCT explicitly targets the positive and negative meta-beliefs about worry that constitute a form of personal superstitious thinking within the GAD population (Wells, 2009).

Compassion-Focused Therapy (CFT)

CFT addresses constructive thinking through the cultivation of self-compassion and the activation of the soothing-affiliation system. Soothing rhythm breathing and compassionate imagery exercises directly enhance emotional coping by downregulating the threat system. Compassionate self-support encourages behavioural activation, thereby addressing behavioural coping deficits. The compassionate reasoning process involves reframing harsh self-judgments, which targets categorical thinking, while self-compassion replaces the shame-based irrational beliefs that characterize personal superstitious thinking. Furthermore, compassionate self-talk promotes a balanced perspective that counters both the excessive pessimism and the naïve optimism poles observed in GAD (Gilbert, 2010).

Clinical Implications

The integrative framework proposed in this paper carries several important implications for clinical practice. First, it suggests that routine assessment of constructive thinking, using instruments such as the CTI and REI, should be incorporated into the clinical evaluation of individuals presenting with GAD. Such assessment can identify specific experiential processing deficits that may be amenable to targeted intervention.

Second, the dimensional mapping of third-wave CBT approaches onto the CTI dimensions provides clinicians with a theoretically grounded rationale for treatment selection and personalization. For example, a GAD patient whose profile is characterized predominantly by deficient emotional coping and elevated categorical thinking might benefit most from a combined MBCT and DBT-informed approach, whereas a patient whose difficulties centre on personal superstitious thinking and behavioural avoidance might respond more favourably to MCT or ACT.

Third, this framework supports the growing trend toward transdiagnostic and modular treatment approaches by identifying shared therapeutic mechanisms across different third-wave CBTs. Clinicians may draw selectively from multiple therapeutic traditions to construct individualized treatment packages that target the specific constructive thinking deficits identified through assessment.

Fourth, the CEST framework highlights the importance of addressing automatic, experiential processes alongside conscious, rational cognition. Therapeutic interventions that focus exclusively on rational cognitive restructuring may be insufficient for patients whose primary deficits lie in the experiential processing system. The third-wave approaches reviewed in this paper offer techniques that are specifically designed to modify experiential processing, making them particularly well-suited for this population.

Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations of the present conceptual review should be acknowledged. First, the integrative framework proposed here is theoretical in nature and requires empirical validation through systematic research. Future studies should examine the relationships between CTI dimension profiles and treatment outcomes across different third-wave CBT modalities using longitudinal and experimental designs.

Second, the mapping of therapeutic mechanisms onto constructive thinking dimensions is based on conceptual analysis rather than empirical decomposition. Component analysis studies that isolate the effects of specific therapeutic techniques on specific CTI dimensions would strengthen the evidentiary basis for the proposed framework.

Third, the present review focuses on GAD as a single diagnostic entity. Future research should examine the applicability of this framework to other anxiety disorders and to comorbid presentations, given the high rates of comorbidity between GAD and other psychiatric conditions.

Fourth, the role of individual differences in rational-experiential processing balance, as measured by the REI, warrants further investigation as a potential moderator of treatment response. Understanding how pre-treatment cognitive processing profiles predict differential response to third-wave CBT approaches could advance the goal of personalized treatment in anxiety disorders.

CONCLUSION

This paper has presented a conceptual framework that integrates Epstein's Cognitive Experiential Self-Theory with contemporary third-wave cognitive behavioral therapies for the understanding and treatment of Generalized Anxiety Disorder. By examining GAD through the lens of constructive thinking and its six constituent dimensions, the paper has elucidated how maladaptive experiential processing contributes to the characteristic cognitive patterns observed in this disorder. The systematic mapping of five third-wave CBT approaches, ACT, MBCT, DBT, MCT, and CFT, onto these dimensions provides a novel integrative framework that may inform both clinical assessment and treatment selection. While empirical validation remains an important future priority, this framework offers clinicians a theoretically coherent and practically useful guide for tailoring evidence-based interventions to the specific experiential processing profiles of individuals with GAD.

REFERENCES

1. Bar-Haim, Y., Lamy, D., Pergamin, L., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M.H. (2007). Threat-related attentional bias in anxious and nonanxious individuals: A meta-analytic study. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.1>
2. Behar, E., DiMarco, I. D., Hekler, E. B., Mohlman, J., & Staples, A. M. (2009). Current theoretical models of generalized anxiety disorder (GAD): Conceptual review and treatment implications. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 23(8), 1011–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2009.07.006>
3. Borkovec, T. D., Alcaine, O. M., & Behar, E. (2004). Avoidance theory of worry and generalized anxiety disorder. In R. G. Heimberg, C. L. Turk, & D. S. Mennin (Eds.), *Generalized anxiety disorder: Advances in research and practice* (pp. 77–108). Guilford Press.
4. Dugas, M. J., Buhr, K., & Ladouceur, R. (2004). The role of intolerance of uncertainty in the etiology and maintenance of generalized anxiety disorder. In R. G. Heimberg, C. L. Turk, & D. S. Mennin (Eds.), *Generalized anxiety disorder: Advances in research and practice* (pp. 143–163). Guilford Press.
5. Epstein, S. (1994). Integration of the cognitive and the psychodynamic unconscious. *American Psychologist*, 49(8), 709–724. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.8.709>
6. Epstein, S. (2001). CTI: Constructive Thinking Inventory: Professional manual. Psychological Assessment Resources.
7. Epstein, S. (2003). Cognitive-experiential self-theory of personality. In T. Millon & M. J. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Personality and social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 159–184). Wiley.
8. Epstein, S., & Meier, P. (1989). Constructive thinking: A broad coping variable with specific components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(2), 332–350. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.332>
9. Epstein, S. (1998). *Constructive Thinking: The Key to Emotional Intelligence*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
10. Gilbert, P. (2010). *Compassion focused therapy: Distinctive features*. Routledge.
11. Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K. D., & Wilson, K. G. (2012). *Acceptance and commitment therapy: The process and practice of mindful change* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
12. Hirsch, C. R., & Mathews, A. (2012). A cognitive model of pathological worry. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 50(10), 636–646. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2012.06.007>
13. Katz, L., & Epstein, S. (1991). Constructive thinking and coping with laboratory-induced stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(5), 789–800. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.5.789>
14. Linehan, M. M. (2015). *DBT skills training manual* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
15. Pacini, R., & Epstein, S. (1999). The relation of rational and experiential information processing styles to personality, basic beliefs, and the ratio-bias phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(6), 972–987. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.6.972>
16. Revicki, D. A., Travers, K., Wyrwich, K. W., Svedsater, H., Locklear, J., & Mattera, M. S. (2012). Humanistic and economic burden of generalized anxiety disorder in North America and Europe. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 140(3), 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2011.11.014>
17. Segal, Z. V., Williams, J. M. G., & Teasdale, J. D. (2013). *Mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for depression: A new approach to preventing relapse* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
18. Wells, A. (2009). *Metacognitive therapy for anxiety and depression*. Guilford Press.
19. Wittchen, H.-U. (2002). Generalized anxiety disorder: Prevalence, burden, and cost to society. *Depression and Anxiety*, 16(4), 162–171. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10065>